



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/989,814	11/20/2001	Robin D. Wilson	VIGN1410	1585
44654 7590 12/04/2009 SPRINKLE IP LAW GROUP 1301 W. 25TH STREET SUITE 408 AUSTIN, TX 78705				
EXAMINER				
PAULA, CESAR B				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2178				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/04/2009		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/989,814

**Applicant(s)**

WILSON ET AL.

**Examiner**

CESAR B. PAULA

**Art Unit**

2178

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 September 2009.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 17-19 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 17-19 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/02)  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/1/09

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to the amendment, and IDS filed on 9/1/2009.

**This action is made Final.**

2. In the amendment, claim 30 has been canceled. Claims 1-8, 17-19 and 21-29 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 17, and 21 are independent claims.

3. The rejections of claims 21-29 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by MyYahoo.com Help Pages, Archive.org, 1999, hereinafter Yahoo, have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

4. The rejections of claims 1-8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahoo, in view of Nazem et al, hereinafter Nazem (USPat.# 5,983,227, 11/9/1999), and further in view of Kelly et al, hereinafter Kelly (USPub. # 2002/00781040 A1, 6/20/2002, filed on 12/19/2000), have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

***Drawings***

5. The drawings filed on 11/20/2001 have been approved by the examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yahoo, in view of Nazem et al, hereinafter Nazem (USPat.# 5,983,227, 11/9/1999), further in view of Kelly et al, hereinafter Kelly (USPub. # 2002/00781040 A1, 6/20/2002, filed on 12/19/2000), and Dunigan et al, 'MCSC Training Guide: Windows NT Workstation 4.0, New Riders Publishing, 1997, pp141-192.

Regarding independent claim 1, Yahoo discloses a main website—Yahoo.com—having many personalized versions of the main website-- *wherein the two or more web sites operating on one or more server machines including the server comprise a first hierarchically organized pair of parent and child web* (pages 1-3).

Moreover, Yahoo teaches that the main website contains assets, such as news, weather, stock prices, sports scores, etc., which are shared with the personalized websites. A user is allowed to configure a version of the Yahoo website, so that it incorporates many of the content of the main website. However, there are certain assets that cannot be modified by the user personalizing the websites (pages 1-6, 10-11)-- *wherein the parent web site utilizes one or more assets in the presentation of the parent web site; and wherein the parent and child web sites are configured to share the one or more assets of the parent web site using a set of asset sharing modes including a first mode; wherein in the first mode, both the parent and child web sites are*

*able to utilize an asset of the parent website, but only the parent web site is able to modify the asset.*

Furthermore, Yahoo teaches that the main website contains assets, such as news, weather, stock prices, sports scores, etc., which are shared with the personalized websites. The main website, and the user have the ability to configure, specify content (such as copyright protected one from news agencies, reuters, france, etc.) , order, etc., the Yahoo website, as the main website and the personalized website that incorporates many of the content of the main website (pages 1-6, 10-11)-- *wherein in the second mode, both the parent and child web sites are able to utilize, and modify the asset of the parent website, both the parent and the child web sites have equal rights to utilize and modify the asset, and wherein at least one of the one or more assets of the parent web site is shared between the parent and the child web sites in the third mode.* Yahoo fails to explicitly disclose: *two or more web sites operating on one or more server machines.* However, Nazem teaches the storage of live data, and a customized web page for storing the live data on a server's shared memory (col.3, lines 59-col.4, line 67). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have stored both main, and custom websites on the same server, because Nazem teaches increasing the convenience of not having to wait for a long time to receive a customized web page(col.4, lines 7-23). This provides the benefit of quickly, and efficiently access the information on the websites.

Further, Yahoo fails to explicitly disclose: *wherein in the third mode, both the parent and the child web sites have equal rights to utilize and modify the asset of the parent web site, wherein the child web site is able to utilize the asset of the parent web site until the child web site attempts to modify the asset of the parent web site, at which time a copy of the asset of the parent*

*web site is generated, wherein the child web site is able to modify the copy of the asset, and wherein the asset of the parent web site is no longer shared between the parent web site and the child web site.* However, Kelly teaches allowing a user to view a web page until an edit content link is selected. The server then produces a copy of an editable version of the web page, besides the original webpage, thereby preventing the user from editing the original web page, and permitting the editing of the editable copy (0067-0068, 0070). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Yahoo, and Kelly, because of all the reasons found in Kelly, including allow unskilled users to easily , and optionally update web pages (0005).

Yahoo fails to explicitly disclose: *a server machine running an application configured for asset sharing management a set of access asset sharing modes defined via the application running on the server machine, the set of asset sharing modes; wherein at least one of the one or more assets of the parent web site is shared between the parent and the child web sites in the third mode as a result of a setting in the application running on the server machine.* However, Dunigan teaches a server manager graphical user interface to allow an administrator to set different level of permissions on shared folders for workstations, domain, etc., (pages 173-192). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Yahoo, and Dunigan, because of all the reasons found in Dunigan, including setting appropriate permissions to allow or restrict access to resources to enable an effective implementation of a Windows NT(server) policy (page 141). Put in other words, a user can manage the access to the all webpages (stored as directories, folders, and files) under the administrator control in a more effective and centralized manner.

Regarding claim 2, which depends on claim 1, Yahoo teaches adding additional pages to the personalized site adding, removing or rearrange the personalized content. MyYahoo website also includes various children websites having specialized content, such as 'Business, Computers'(pages 1-2), etc. The content is shared or had in common with the MyYahoo website display of a portion of the shared content-- *wherein the two or more web sites operating on the server further comprise a second hierarchically organized pair of parent and child web sites, wherein the child web site of the second hierarchically organized pair is a descendant of the child web site of the first hierarchically organized pair, and wherein the child web site of the first hierarchically organized pair and the descendant are configured to share one or more assets of the child web site of the first hierarchically organized pair using one or more of the first, second and third modes* (pages 1-6, 15-16).

Regarding claim 3, which depends on claim 1, Yahoo teaches adding additional pages to the personalized site adding, removing or rearrange the personalized content. The main website, and the user have the ability to configure the Yahoo website (as the main website), the personalized website, and the additional pages—*descendant*-- that incorporate many of the content of the main website. MyYahoo website also includes various children websites having specialized content, such as 'Business, Computers'(pages 1-2), etc. The content is shared or had in common with the MyYahoo website -- *wherein if an asset shared between the child web site of the first hierarchically organized pair and the descendant is also shared between the parent and the child web sites of the first hierarchically organized pair, the asset is shared between the*

*child web site of the first hierarchically organized pair and the descendant in a mode which is no less restrictive than the mode in which the asset is shared between the parent and the child web sites of the first hierarchically organized pair* (pages 1-6, 10-11, 15-16).

Regarding claim 4, which depends on claim 1, Yahoo teaches that the main and the personalized sites share information by allowing the personalized site to collect favorite parts of the main site--*wherein the parent and the child web sites share a plurality of assets as a set* (pages 1-6, 10-11, 15-16).

Regarding claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Yahoo teaches that the main and the personalized sites share information by allowing the personalized site to collect favorite parts, such as news, weather, stock prices, etc., of the main site--*wherein the parent and the child web sites share one or more assets individually* (pages 1-6, 10-11).

Regarding claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Yahoo teaches that the main and the personalized sites share some of the information by allowing the personalized site to collect favorite parts of the main site. There is certain information which cannot be changed by the personalized site-- *wherein the parent web site has one or more assets which are not shared with the child web site* (pages 1-6, 10-11).

Regarding claim 7, which depends on claim 1, Yahoo teaches that the personalized website contains assets editing resources, such as edit, and personalizing icons, which are not



used by the main website which are only shared with the personalized websites-- *wherein the child web site has one or more assets which are not shared with the parent web site* (pages 1-6, 10-11).

Regarding claim 8, which depends on claim 1, Yahoo teaches that the personalized website contains assets editing resources, such as edit, and personalizing icons, which are not used by the main website, only by the personalized site pages which are only shared with the personalized websites -- *wherein each web site of the two or more web sites operating on the server can share assets only with direct descendants of the web site--* (pages 1-6, 10-11).

8. Claims 17-19 remain, and 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MyYahoo.com Help Pages, Archive.org, 1999, hereinafter Yahoo, in view of Kelly et al, hereinafter Kelly (USPub. # 2002/00781040 A1, 6/20/2002, filed on 12/19/2000).

Regarding independent claim 17, Yahoo teaches that the main website contains assets, such as categories of news--*channel*, weather, stock prices, sports scores, images (ebay images), etc., which are shared with the personalized websites. A user(s) is allowed to configure a version of the Yahoo website, so that it incorporates many of the content of the main website. However, there are certain assets that cannot be modified by the user personalizing the websites. The user(s) can also rearrange the content in the personalized website (pages 1-11)-- *at a server computer connected to client computers over a network, selecting an asset of a first object, wherein the asset is used in the presentation of a web site operating on the server computer,*

*wherein the web site comprises one or more web pages and a plurality of assets, wherein the plurality of assets comprises architectural assets and features of the web site, wherein the architectural assets of the web site comprise a channel, wherein the features of the web site comprise an image, and wherein the selected asset is one of the features of the web site or one of the architectural assets of the web site; and sharing the selected asset with a second object, wherein the second object is a child of the first object in a hierarchical structure of a set of web sites, wherein the child is a child web site comprising one or more webpages, wherein sharing the selected asset comprises enabling the first object to utilize and modify the selected asset, presenting the child web site with the modified copy of the selected asset to the client computers over the network. Yahoo fails to explicitly disclose: setting an asset sharing mode that enables the second object to utilize the selected asset of the first object until the second object attempts to modify the selected asset of the first object, making a copy of the selected asset when the second object attempts to modify the selected asset of the first object and thereafter disabling the second object's ability to utilize the selected asset of the first object and enabling the second object to modify and utilize the copy of the selected asset. However, Kelly teaches allowing a user to view a web page until an edit content link is selected. The server then produces a copy of an editable version of the web page, thereby preventing the user from editing the original web page, and permitting the editing of the editable copy (0067-0068, 0070). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Yahoo, and Kelly, because of all the reasons found in Kelly, including allow unskilled users to easily , and optionally update web pages (0005).*

Regarding claim 18, which depends on claim 17, Yahoo teaches that the main and the personalized sites share some information by allowing the personalized site to collect favorite parts of the main site. There is certain information which cannot be changed by the personalized site, but is edited by the main site -- *wherein the parent has one or more assets which are not shared with the child* (pages 1-6, 10-11).

Regarding claim 19, which depends on claim 17, Yahoo teaches that the main website contains assets, such as news, weather, stock prices, sports scores, etc., which are shared with the personalized websites. The main website, and the user have the ability to configure the Yahoo website, as the main website and the personalized website that incorporates many of the content of the main website-- *sharing a second asset of the first object with the second object, wherein sharing the second asset comprises enabling the first object and the second object to utilize and modify the second asset* (pages 1-6, 10-11).

Regarding independent claim 21, Yahoo discloses a main website—Yahoo.com—having many personalized versions of the main website—at a server computer connected to client computers over a network, selecting two objects which have a hierarchical relationship wherein a first one of the objects is a parent of a second one of the objects (pages 1-3).

Moreover, Yahoo teaches that the main website contains assets, such as news, weather, stock prices, sports scores, etc., which are shared with the personalized websites. A user is allowed to configure a version of the Yahoo website, so that it incorporates many of the content of the main

website. However, there are certain assets that cannot be modified by the user personalizing the websites (pages 1-6, 10-11)—*wherein the first object has one or more assets.*

Further, Yahoo teaches that the main website contains assets, such as news, weather, stock prices, sports scores, etc., which are shared with the personalized websites. The main website, and the user have the ability to configure the Yahoo website, as the main website and the personalized website that incorporates many of the content of the main website (pages 1-6, 10-11)-- *setting an asset sharing mode for the second object to share an asset of the first object in which both the first object and the second object have equal rights to utilize and modify the asset of the first object.*

Furthermore, Yahoo fails to explicitly disclose: *wherein the second object can is able to utilize the asset of the first object until the second object attempts to modify the asset of the first object, at which time a copy of the asset of the first object is generated, where the second object can is able to utilize and modify the copy of the asset, and wherein the asset of the first object is no longer shared between the first object and the second object; wherein setting an asset sharing mode in which at least one of the selected assets of the first object is shared between the first and the second objects in the third mode.* However, Kelly teaches allowing a user to set a mode for viewing a web page until an edit content link is selected. The server then produces a copy of an editable version of the web page, besides the original webpage, thereby preventing the user from editing the original web page, and permitting the editing of the editable copy (0067-0068, 0070). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Yahoo, and Kelly, because of all the reasons found in Kelly, including allow unskilled users to easily , and optionally update web pages (0005).

Regarding claim 22, which depends on claim 21, Yahoo teaches adding additional pages to the personalized site adding, removing or rearrange the personalized content. The main website, and the user have the ability to configure the Yahoo website (as the main website), the personalized website, and the additional pages—*descendant*-- that incorporate many of the content of the main website -- *wherein if an asset shared between the first object and the second object is also shared between the second object and the third object, the asset is shared between the second object and the third object in a mode which is no less restrictive than the mode in which the asset is shared between the first object and the second object*(pages 1-6, 10-11, 15-16).

Regarding claim 23, which depends on claim 21, Yahoo teaches that the main and the personalized sites share information by allowing the personalized site to collect favorite parts of the main site--*wherein the first object and the second object sharing a plurality of assets as a set* (pages 1-6, 10-11, 15-16).

Regarding claim 24, which depends on claim 23, Yahoo teaches that the main website contains assets, such as news (containing current events, magazine, etc.)--*class of assets*--, weather, stock prices, sports scores, etc., which are shared with the personalized websites. (pages 1-6, 10-11).

Regarding claim 25, which depends on claim 24, Yahoo teaches that the main website contains assets, such as news (containing current events, magazine, etc.), weather, stock prices,

sports scores, etc.--*the class of assets is a child of a base asset class--* which are shared with the personalized websites (pages 1-9).

Regarding claim 26, which depends on claim 21, Yahoo teaches that the main and the personalized sites share information by allowing the personalized site to collect favorite parts, such as news, weather, stock prices, etc., of the main site--*wherein the first and second object sharing one or more assets individually* (pages 1-6, 10-11).

Regarding claim 27, which depends on claim 21, Yahoo teaches that the main and the personalized sites share some of the information by allowing the personalized site to collect favorite parts of the main site. There is certain information, which cannot be changed by the personalized site-- *wherein the method further comprises the first object utilizing one or more assets, which are not shared with the second object* (pages 1-6, 10-11).

Regarding claim 28, which depends on claim 21, Yahoo teaches that the personalized website contains assets editing resources, such as edit, and personalizing icons, which are not used by the main website which are only shared with the personalized websites-- *wherein the method further comprises the second object utilizing one or more assets which are not shared with the first object.* (pages 1-6, 10-11).

Regarding claim 29, which depends on claim 21, Yahoo teaches that the personalized website contains assets editing resources, such as edit, and personalizing icons, which are not

used by the main website, only by the personalized site pages which are only shared with the personalized websites. -- *wherein the method further comprises each object sharing assets only with direct descendants of the object.*-- (pages 1-6, 10-11).

### ***Response to Arguments***

9. Applicant's arguments filed on 9/1/2009 have been fully considered but they are moot. Regarding claims 1-8, and 21-29, Applicant states that Yahoo fails to teach the amended subject matter (page 7, last parag.-page8, parag.1). The Applicant is directed towards the new rejection of the claims above as necessitated by the amendment.

10. Applicant's arguments filed on 9/1/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding claims 17-19, Applicant submits 'As indicated by Primary Examiner Paula on August 21, 2009, claim 17 as amended herein recites subject matter not found in Yahoo and hence Yahoo combined with Kelly, thereby sufficiently overcoming the rejections of claims 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).' (page 8, parag.2). Applicant is directed towards the rejection of the claims above in light of the combination of Yahoo, and Kelly.

### ***Conclusion***

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about



Art Unit: 2178

access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- **(571)-273-8300** (for **all** Formal communications intended for entry)

/CESAR B PAULA/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178
---

12/5/2009